APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/515,310	02/29/2000	John M. Quernemoen	RA-5244	2025

7590   12/16/2002

UNISYS Corporation
Attn Charles A Johnson
M S 4773
P O Box 64942
St Paul, MN   55164-0942

EXAMINER
DODDS, HAROLD E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2177	

DATE MAILED: 12/16/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/515,310	QUERNEMOEN, JOHN M.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Harold E. Dodds, Jr.	2177

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _23 September 2002_ .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-15_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-15_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _29 February 2000_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
        application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .	6)☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claims 1 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Bartlett et al. (U.S. patent No. 6,263,382), Benmohamed et al. (U.S. Patent No.

6,240,463), Hayashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,857,195), and Ong (U.S. Patent No.

5,815,662).

3.   Bartlett rendered obvious independent claim 1 by the following:

"...obtaining at least one user defined workload requirement..." at col. 3, lines 19-21.

"...of said user defined workload requirement..." at col. 3, lines 19-21.

Bartlet does not teach the calculation and displaying requirements, the use of

database management systems, the use of server hardware requirements, and the use

of functions.

4.   However, Benmohamed teaches the calculation and display of

requirements and the use of functions as follows:

"...calculating the...requirements..." at col. 12, lines 30-34.

"...as a function..." at col. 4, lines 49-53.

"...displaying...requirements..." at col. 13, lines 25-28.

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to use the user input to calculate hardware requirements using mathematical equations or functions and then displaying the results of these calculations to the users in order to provide a system, which processes user input and provides feedback to the users on the effects of the input data on hardware models.

Benmohamed does not teach the use of database management systems and the use of server hardware requirements.

5.   However, Hayashi teaches the use of database management systems as follows:

"...database management system..." at col. 1, lines 29-33.

"...said database management system..." at col. 1, lines 29-33.

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to use database management system (DBMS) requirements as requirements for a system in order to provide a standard method for using a computer system to store data and gain acceptance for the method of determining hardware requirements.

Hayashi does not teach the use of server hardware requirements.

6.   However, Ong teaches the use of server hardware requirements as follows:

"...server hardware requirements..." col. 3, lines 10-15.

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to use server hardware requirements in the specification of a computer system in order to provide requirements for the hardware components contain the database

management system software, which processes query requests to databases and

provides interface access for these queries and then returns the results of these queries

to the users.

7.   As per claim 5, the "...a number of users supported...," is taught by Ong at

col. 6, lines 9-11.

8.   Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Bartlett, Benmohamed, Hayashi, and Ong as applied to claim 1 above, and further in

view of Kulkarni et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,138,016).

As per claim 2, the "...a plurality of inputs from a user...," is taught by Bartlett at

col. 3, lines 19-21,

the "...including a server type...," is taught by Bartlett at col. 3, lines 42-46,

the "...a maximum desired processor utilization...," is taught by Bartlett at col. 16, lines

25-29,

but the "...and a transactions per second requirement...," is not taught by either Bartlett,

Benmohamed, Hayashi, or Ong.

However, Kulkarni teaches the use of transactions per second as follows:

```
"...To overcome the requirement of localizing the HLR in a
single expensive machine, with a very high rate of messages per
second and data base transactions per second, and according to
this invention, the HLR function is distributed across multiple
processors..." at col. 1, lines 58-62.
```

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the

invention to use transactions per second to measure the throughput of processors in

order to use a standard means of measurement to quantify the use of the processors.

9.   Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Bartlett, Benmohamed, Hayashi, and Ong as applied to claim 1 above, and further in

view of Tan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,356,902).

As per claim 3, the "...a number of processors requirement..., is taught by Bartlett

at col. 11, lines 66-67,

the "...and a mass storage requirement...," is taught by Bartlett at col. 8, lines 50-52,

but the "...a memory size requirement...," is not taught by either Bartlett, Benmohamed,

Hayashi, or Ong.

However, Tan teaches the use of a memory size requirement as follows:

```
"...Introducing null nodes has a harmful effect on the memory
size requirement of virtual memory data processing systems,
wherein fixed-length blocks of memory often referred to as
"page" are utilized..." at col. 1, lines 55-59.
```

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the

invention to use memory size requirement as a measure of physical blocks of memory

used for storing data in order to use a standard feature of data storage architecture and

obtain better acceptance of the method for determining server hardware requirements.

10.   Claims 4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Bartlett, Benmohamed, Hayashi, and Ong as applied to claim 1 above, and further

in view of Yamaji et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,495,562).

As per claim 4, the "...an effective CPU utilization...," is not taught by either

Bartlett, Benmohamed, Hayashi, or Ong.

However, Yamaji teaches the use of effective central processing unit (CPU)

utilization as follows:

"...As is apparent from the foregoing definitions, the progress
rate coefficient of the job i is equal to the sum of the
utilization (CPU_i/$ESTIME_i$) for the CPU by each job and the
utilization (IO_i/$ESTIME_i$) for the I/O device by each job and is
interpreted to be the net utilization of the job i. Therefore,
the average progress rate coefficient is interpreted to be an
average of the net utilization of each job, especially an
effective average weight by the elapse time $ESTIME_i$ and the
throughput coefficient is interpreted to be the total of the net
utilizations of the respective jobs..." at col. 5, lines 24-34.

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the

invention to use effective CPU utilization as a measure of activity of a CPU activity in

order to use a commonly used means to determine the extent of processing being

performed by the CPU.

11.   As per claim 6, the "...an effective CPU utilization...," ia taught by Yamaji

at col. 5, lines 24-34

and the "...a number of users supported...," is taught by Ong at col. 6, lines 9-11.

12.   Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Bartlett, Benmohamed, Hayashi, and Ong as applied to claim 1 above, and further in

view of Blake et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,067,412).

As per claim 7, the "...and said properties include a calculated...," is taught by

Benmohamed at col. 12, lines 30-34,

the "...and a ratio of said calculated...," is taught by Benmohamed at col. 12, lines 30-34,

and the "...wherein said calculating step calculates values for said calculated...ratio...,"

is taught by Benmohamed at col. 12, lines 30-34,

but the "...a baseline system...,"

the "...transactions per second...,"

the "...transactions per second value...,"

the "...transactions per second...,"

the "...transactions per second...,"

the "...to said baseline...,'

the "...transactions per second...,"

and the "...and said transactions per second...," are not taught by either Bartlett,

Benmohamed, Hayashi, or Ong.

However Blake teaches the use of a baseline system and transactions per

second as follows:

"...This information about the performance of the operating
system is preferably generated during the construction of the
model by using the synthetic workload generator to apply known
workloads to a baseline computer system and using the actual
performance measurements as an indication of the operating
system performance...." at col. 9, lines 44-48.

:...Thus, if the current CPU was replaced by a CPU that was
twice as fast, the computer system still could only handle 2
transactions per second..." at col. 2, lines 8-10.

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the

invention to use a baseline computer system in order to provide a standard reference to

the workload of a computer to compare against actual workload performance. Likewise,

it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention

to use transactions per second to measure the throughput of processors in order to use

a standard means of measurement to quantify the use of the processors.

13.   Claims 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Bartlett et al. (U.S. patent No. 6,263,382), Friedrich et al. (U.S. Patent No.

5,276,877), Culley (U.S. Patent No. 5,125,088), Garofalakis et al. (U.S. Patent No.

5,845,279), and Benmohamed et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,240,463).

14.   Bartlett rendered obvious independent claim 8 by the following:

"...obtaining at least one input from a user..." at col. 3, lines 19-21.

"...obtaining from said user..." at col. 3, lines 19-21.

Bartlet does not teach the use of transactions, the use of workload contributions,

the use of an expected execution rate, calculating a total workload, and displaying the

results of the calculations to users.

15.   However, Friedrich teaches the use of transactions, and the use of

workload contributions as follows:

"...a plurality of transactions..." at col. 11, lines 44-52.

"...wherein each of said transactions have..." at col. 11, lines 44-52.

"...a transaction..." at col. 11, lines 44-52.

"...workload contribution..." at col. 26, lines 18-23.

"...calculating a total workload..." at col. 19, lines 29-32.

"...transaction..." at col. 11, lines 44-52.

"...workload contribution..." at col. 26, lines 18-23.

"...and transaction..." at col. 11, lines 44-52.

"...of said transactions..." at col. 11, lines 44-52.

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the

invention to use transactions as basic units of processor throughput in order to use

standard quantifiable units. Likewise, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily

skilled in the art at the time of the invention to use the workload contribution of these transactions in order to differentiate between the various inputs used to determine the processing capability of a computer system.

Friedrich does not teach the use of an expected execution rate, calculating total workloads, and displaying the results of the calculations to users.

16.   However, Culley teaches the use of expected execution rares as follows: "...and an expected execution rate per second..." at col. 19, lines 55-62.

"...execution rate..." at col. 19, lines 55-62.

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to use expected execution rates in order to define a model for a baseline computer system and compare the baseline model with the actual results obtained.

Culley does not teach calculating total workloads and displaying the results of the calculations to users.

17.   However, Garovalakis teaches calculating total workloads as follows: "...calculating...as a function..." at col. 8, lines 6-8 and col. 8, lines 24-28.

"...said total workload..." at col. 14, lines 27-29.

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to calculate total workloads in order to determine the workload on a computer system, which is defined as the total contribution of all the transactions used in this model.

Garovalakis does not teach displaying the results of the calculations to users.

18.   However, Benmohamed teaches displaying the results of the calculations

to users ad follows.

"...and display...to said human user...." at col. 13, lines 25-28.

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the

invention to display the results of calculations to the users in order to provide feedback

to the users on the effects of the input data on hardware models.

19.   As per claim 9, the "...include a server type...," is taught by Bartlett at col.

3, lines 42-46.

20.   As per claim 10, the "...maximum desired processor utilization...," is taught

by Bartlett col. 16, lines 25-29.

21.   As per claim 11, the "...maximum desired...utilization...," is taught by

Bartlett col. 16, lines 25-29

and the "...network interface card...," is taught by Bartlett at col. 3, lines 47-54.

22.   Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Bartlett, Friedrich, Culley, Garofalakis, and Benmohamed as applied to claim 8 above,

and further in view of Schumacher et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,032,664).

As per claim 12, the "...a server type...," is taught by Bartlett at col. 3, lines 42-46,

the "...a maximum desired processor utilization...," is taught by Bartlett col. 16, lines 25-

29,

the "...a maximum desired...utilization...," is taught by Bartlett col. 16, lines 25-29,

the "...network interface card...," is taught by Bartlett at col. 3, lines 47-54,

but the "...a LAN speed...," is not taught by either Bartlett, Friedrich, Culley, Garofalakis,

or Benmohamed.

However, Schumacher teaches the use of LAN speeds as follows:

```
"...The Remote Node method requires less equipment and software
than the Remote Control method, and the remote user's
application executes the same as if he were working directly on
one of the LAN's nodes with the only difference being
communication speed versus LAN speed..." at col. 2, lines 50-54.
```

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the

invention to use LAN speed in the calculations for the throughput of a multi-computer

system in order to use to speed of communications between the processors when

determining the throughput of the system.

23.   Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Bartlett, Friedrich, Culley, Garofalakis, Benmohamed, and

Schumacher as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Reiner et al. (U.S.

Patent No. 6,289,334).

As per claim 13, the "...each of said transactions...," is taught by Friedrich at col.

11, lines 44-52,

the "...wherein each of said transaction...," is taught by Friedrich at col. 11, lines 44-52,

the "...workloads...," is taught by Friedrich at col. 26, lines 18-23,

the "...are calculated by calculating...," is taught by Benmohamed at col. 12, lines 30-34,

the "...a workload contribution...," is taught by Friedrich at col. 26, lines 18-23,

the "...and wherein a percent contribution...," is taught by Friedrich at col. 26, lines 18-

23,

the "...of total workload is specified...," is taught by Friedrich at col. 19, lines 29-32,

but the "...include at least one SQL statement..."

and the "...of each of said SQL statements...," are not taught by either Bartlett, Friedrich,

Culley, Garofalakis, Benmohamed, or Schumacher.

However, Reiner teaches the use of SQJ statements as follows:

```
"...The QD SORT building block is structurally similar to the
AGGREGATE building block: it has QD-generated SQL statements to
create a temporary sort table, insert rows in that table, select
rows in sorted order from that table, and drop the table when it
is finished with it..." at col. 67, lines 15-19.
```

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the

invention to use SQL statements when determining the throughput of a computer

system in order to use the basic command statements of a database management

system language to help determine the throughput of a computer system using a

database management system.

24.   As per claim 14, the "...said SQL statements...," is taught by Reiner at col.

67, lines 15-19,

the "...include insert...," is taught by Reiner at col. 56, lines 36-39,

the "...delete...," is taught by Reiner at col. 67, lines 23-25,

the "...update...," is taught by Reiner at col. 64, lines 29-31,

the "...and select...," is taught by Reiner at col. 56, lines 36-39,

and the "...SQL statement types...," is taught by Reiner at col. 67, lines 15-19.

25.   Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Bartlett, Friedrich, Culley, Garofalakis, Benmohamed, Schumacher, and Reiner as

applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of Berenson et al. (U.S. Patent No.
6,356,887).

As per claim 15, the "...said insert SQL types...," is taught by Reiner at col. 56,
lines 36-39,

the "...have parameters...,' is taught by Reiner at col. 56, lines 36-39,

the "...including...insert statements...," is taught by Reiner at col. 56, lines 36-39,

the "...and wherein said insert statement...," is taught by Reiner at col. 56, lines 36-39,

the "...SQL workload contribution...," is taught by Friedrich at col. 26, lines 18-23,

the "...is a function...," is taught by Reiner at col. 53, lines 10-14,

the "...of said statement parameters...," is taught by Reiner at col. 56, lines 36-39,

the "...said delete SQL types...," is taught by Reiner at col. 67, lines 23-25,

the "...have parameters...," is taught by Reiner at col. 56, lines 36-39,

the "...including...delete statements...," is taught by Reiner at col. 67, lines 23-25,

the "...and wherein said delete statement...," is taught by Reiner at col. 67, lines 23-25,

the "...SQL workload contribution...," is taught by Friedrich at col. 26, lines 18-23,

the "...is a function...," is taught by Reiner at col. 53, lines 10-14,

the "...of said statement parameters...," is taught by Reiner at col. 56, lines 36-39,

the "...said update SQL types...," is taught by Reiner at col. 64, lines 29-31,

the "...have parameters...," is taught by Reiner at col. 56, lines 36-39,

the "...including a number of records...," is taught by Reiner at col. 10, line 67 abd col.
11, lines 1-2,

the "...to be operated on...," is taught by Reiner at col. 37, lines 2-4,

the "...by said update statement...," is taught by Reiner at col. 64, lines 29-31,

the "...and wherein said update statement...," is taught by Reiner at col. 64, lines 29-31,

the "...SQL workload contribution...," is taught by Friedrich at col. 26, lines 18-23,

the "...is a function...," is taught by Reiner at col. 53, lines 10-14,

the "...of said statement parameters...," is taught by Reiner at col. 56, lines 36-39,

the "...and said select SQL types...," is taught by Reiner at col. 56, lines 36-39,

the "...have parameters...," is taught by Reiner at col. 56, lines 36-39,

the "...including selectivity criteria...," is taught by Reiner at col. 29, lines 57-61,

the "...and wherein said select statement...," is taught by Reiner at col. 56, lines 36-39,

the "...SQL workload contribution...," is taught by Friedrich at col. 26, lines 18-23,

the "...is a function...," is taught by Reiner at col. 53, lines 10-14,

the "...of said statement parameters...," is taught by Reiner at col. 56, lines 36-39,

but the "...a number of identical...statements..."

and the "...a number of identical...statements...," are not taught by either Bartlett,

Friedrich, Culley, Garofalakis, Benmohamed, Schumacher, or Reiner.

However, Berenson teaches the use of a number of identical statements as

follows:

"...When those applications issue a large number of simple
statements, compilation time can become the dominant cost
factor..." at col. 1, lines 54-56.

"...Such an unsafe execution plan will only be reused if an
identical statement is received..." at col. 13, lines 43-45.

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the

invention to use the number of identical statements with insert statements and delete

statements in order to simplify the calculation associated with determining the

throughput of a system having a database management system.

Response to Arguments

26.   Applicant's arguments filed 23 September 2002 have been fully

considered but they are not persuasive. In the argument for independent claims 1 and 8

on page 19, paragraph 3 and page 20, paragraph 1, the Applicant states as follows:

"The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejections or in some instances with the
bases of the rejections...Many of the references did not all appear to be from the same
field of art of the present invention or even relative to each other. The suggestion or the
motivation for combining elements or terms from the several or many various cited
references might be regarded as being readily apparent to the Applicant."

The combined the teaching of Bartlett, Benmohamed, Hayashi, and Ong are

used to reject independent claim 1. Bartlett, Benmohamed, Hayashi, and Ong use

several elements in common. Bartlett, Benmohamed, Hayashi, and Ong teach having

requirements, the utilization of resources, and using user inputs, Bartlett, Benmohamed,

and Ong teach the use of software, the use of computer memory, the use of networks,

the use of the Internet, and the use of models, and Bartlett, Hayashi, and Ong teach the

use of tables and the processing of data.

The combined teachings of Bartlett, Friedrich, Culley, Garofalakis, and

Benmohamed are used to reject independent claim 8. Bartlett, Friedrich, Culley,

Garofalakis, and Benmohamed use several elements in common. Bartlett, Friedrich,

Culley, Garofalakis, and Benmohamed teach the use of software, the use of computer

memory, and the utilization of resources, Bartlett, Friedrich, Garofalakis, and

Benmohamed teach the use of networks and the use of models, Bartlett, Culley,

Garofalakis, and Benmohamed teach having requirements, Bartlett, Friedrich, and

Culley teach the use of hardware, Bartlett, Friedrich, and Garofalakisteach the use of

servers, and Bartlett, Friedrich, and Benmohamed teach the use of user input.

27.   The Applicant does not provide any arguments with specific challenges to

any of the technology used to render obvious the claims in this application.

Conclusion

28.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of

time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

29.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from

the examiner should be directed to Harold E. Dodds, Jr. whose telephone number is

(703)-305-1802. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:00 -

4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John E. Breene can be reached on (703)-305-9790. The fax phone

numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)

746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final

communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)-

305-3900.

Harold E. Dodds, Jr.
December 12, 2002

GRETA ROBINSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER